

- **Board Counsel** Stephen Shaw
- **Consultant Engineer** Hatch Mott McDonald

- **Planning Consultant** Robert Michaels
- **Board/Recording Secretary** Mary Ann Fasano
- **Planning Board Manager** Kali Tsimbouski
- **Establishing Meeting Schedule** (includes Revision of Jan 10<sup>th</sup> site visit)
- **Designating Newspaper** Chatham Courier and  
Morris County Daily record.

**Minutes:** November 13, 2013 carried to next meeting

**Memorialization:**

**Mrs. Hagner & Mr. Novick**  
396 River Road.  
Block: 62 Lot: 85.

**Calendar BOA 13-62-85 3**

Mr. Nelson made a motion to accept the Resolution as submitted, seconded by Mrs. Kenny

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Weston, Mr. Polise, Mrs. Kenny, Mrs. Romano, Mr. Williams  
- All in Favor

**Mr. & Mrs. Lee,**  
7 Yarmouth  
Road. Block: 86 Lot: 8.

**Calendar BOA 13-86-8**

Mr. Williams made a motion to accept the Resolution as submitted, seconded by Mr. Nelson

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Weston, Mr. Polise, Mrs. Kenny, Mrs. Romano, Mr. Williams -  
All in favor

**Hearings:**

**New Cingular Wireless**  
**Pcs LLC (AT &T)**  
63 Buxton Road  
Block: 62 Lot: 105.

**Calendar BOA 13-62-105**

Mr. Shaw said a written request had been received from the applicant to have this matter carried to February. They have also granted a written extension for action through March 1<sup>st</sup>. He said it would be appropriate to entertain a motion to carry this to the meeting of February 20<sup>th</sup> with a notice to any members of the public present that it will be carried to that date without further legal notices.

Mr. Weston wanted to make a comment before the motion. He was concerned

that with the delay as well as extending the hearing and with the proposed rulemaking that is out there, it could have the effect of making our hearings, to him, moot. The public hearing period or comment period for that closes out February 3<sup>rd</sup>. The responses to public comments close on March 9<sup>th</sup> and he understood that there may be nothing that could be done on this but he wanted to go on the record that he was concerned that this might be a case of “running down the clock”.

Mr. Shaw advised that the reason they were not ready is because they were requested by the Board to go on to several different locations to get measurements. There was some delay over the Holidays and some of the other utilities being allowed to get onto the poles so they didn't have that data available.

Mr. Vivona asked for a motion to carry this application as requested. A motion was made by Mr. Nelson seconded by Mr. Williams to carry as requested. All in Favor.

Mr. Shaw also asked Mr. Williams (Rick) to put on the record his relationship as a former employee.

Mr. Williams wanted to make sure that the people involved in the zoning questions regarding the cell antenna realize that he did work for ATT as a Chief Engineer but never had been involved in their Cellular activities.

**Mr. & Mrs. Warren**

**Calendar BOA 13-20-20**

23 Susan Drive  
Block: 20 Lot: 20.

**Applicant:** Katy & Michael Warren, Sworn

**Engineer:** Aidan (Thomas) Murphy of Murphy & Hollows

**Contractor:** Terrance Stone, Harrington Contractors, Construction Superintendent

Site Visit Report of January 11, 2014 read

Mrs. Warren said they had taken pictures of the site (A-14, a, b, c, etc.). As requested she prepared a history of the site, lot 20, and read same into the record (copies distributed).

Mr. Vivona thought we needed to start by figuring out how we will repair the damage done before anything else can happen. These lots are notorious and in his opinion should never have gotten variances relief in 2007. Every time someone builds on them there are major problems to the properties below. Mr. Ruschke has put in many steps to protect the residents and those not followed have been a problem. We need to figure out what the plans are and maybe we should speak with your engineer on how we can rectify the situation so it will not happen again.

Mr. Murphy, previously sworn, said that they had prepared a slope stabilization which would be a permanent conclusion to the problem that had been created on this property. Right now there is temporary stabilization on site. To his knowledge there is no offsite siltation. It has all been contained. There were the original silt fences that were down below. The silt fence on top got washed out. We went back in and put in rows of super silt fence which have held. There was a maintenance issue on one but it has been corrected.

Mr. Shaw asked for a description of a super silt fence.

Mr. Murphy said it was a chain link fence which holds up the silt fence in front of it. Before the silt fence was just held up with stakes in the ground which on slopes could easily be knocked over.

With that said, the plan now is to create a permanent stabilization to the property. Because of the slope of the land we have to go in with matting which we have shown as EFP3. This matting is meant for slopes for 1.5 to 1. We have shown the proper stabilization. We will have to bring in top soil to replace soil that had been washed out. Actually there wasn't much topsoil on site but we are putting in a layer of top soil, seeding it and then on top of that we will put this mat to hold everything in place so the seeding can take hold.

Mr. Vivona asked if the drainage pits were in that matted area.

Mr. Murphy thought they were down below where the slope breaks. The trick now is to get from point A to point B. We have to cross the slope. It had been part of our plan with only a small area of disturbance. We have to go in and put those two connections (sanitary/storm sewer) and would like to do that now before we go in to stabilize it.

Mr. Shaw asked if there was a defined area where you will be accessing that.

Mr. Murphy said it was along the west side of the property. He then deferred to Mr. Stone of Harrington Construction.

Mr. Stone, sworn, said they were hired to install the seepage pits, sewer line and dig the building foundation, back fill and top soil. We have already dug the foundation. Basically what happened was when we went to start cutting the material was too loose. We didn't feel it was adequate so we talked to the building inspector and asked him for permission to do a test bore and when the report came back it was insufficient to hold the house. We hired an engineer who came up with the design to excavate 8 foot of the loose fill and repack it with a packing type material. We rolled it to stabilize the house so it wouldn't slide down the hill. We had dug a hole in the hill and lost part of the bank. These houses are built in tiers. The bottom is done and we don't see any problem with anything else running down the hill. The problem we have is just connecting the sewer to the seepage pits before we stabilize the hill. The tier on top is pretty stable and we have good results from that

Mr. Laverti - we started moving up the hill we found existing rock which was close to the loose material that was dumped over the side of the road.

Mr. Stone said they had just gone ahead and done this. He had called the building inspector who gave us permission. He had said to go ahead. We had about eight inches of rain that night.

Mr. Laverti – when we excavated down below the footing we went about 8 ft. deep. The top of that slope basically was loose and just slid down the hill from the rain. The silt fences were in place and they actually had held. When the issue happened Mr. Ruschke said to come up with a plan to stabilize and that is why we put the other silt fences in.

Mr. Stone said they had tried to do the right thing but noted that it is just a difficult site. When questioned about the silt fences he said there had been two on the top.

Mr. Laverti – the silt fences and hay bales at the bottom of the hill were existing at the time of the washout. They held the material. There was a silt fence up high and it was at the point where we did our excavation. Basically the material below it slid out. As explained, the bank was straight down to the edge of the limit of disturbance. We had to go back. Mr. Ruschke can attest to it. When you fill an area you have to go outside that area in order for proper compaction to bring it up to the point where your foundation will be sitting. He pointed out that all the super silt fences that had been damaged have been repaired and the washout happened under the silt fence not over it. Material could not go over it as there was an eight foot hole there.

Mr. Vivona – in terms of the process of having to disturb the steep slopes again in order to install the sewer lines and the other things - how long will that be and what sort of interim protections are you proposing everyday to protect that steep slope when you are done working on it?

Mr. Stone said they would have to remove the silt fence and re-install it every evening after we have done our work. By the time you bring the pits in and run the sewer and storm pipe off the slope we will have about two weeks of work in there. In order to complete that work we have to access the slope from the top and bottom. The way the Resolution was is that we would bring the pits in from the bottom, not the top. That is what the access road was for at the bottom. That is still our plan. From the top we would have to basically dig half way from the middle of the slope down and the other half would be from the top up into a storm pipe. The machine we need to use would be a sixteen ton, anything larger would not fit.

Mr. Vivona, to clarify, you would have to - from your foundation - reach down and then haul it back around through the easement to reach up. Mr. Stone said that was correct. We will have to come in from Marion Road because of the weight of the machine (easement behind Molino's.)

Mrs. Warren said that they already had permission from the property owners involved.

Mr. Vivona, asked Mr. Murphy if once this was started and dug is it a feasible thing to – well you can't start the restoration until that is in because you are just doing double the work.

Mr. Murphy said that was correct. The restoration can't be done until spring because that is the seeding/planting time. The applicant would like to do the drywell and connection now, keep up the super silt fence and then stock pile topsoil down by the seepage pits. They would then push that top soil up the slopes which should compact it as he is pushing; put the seed on with the erosion matting on top and then we won't have to go on that silt anymore.

Mr. Vivona to clarify – you want to dig it now and put a patch on it until spring? Confirmed.

Mr. Stone in the beginning of the season it will be ready to be done.

Mr. Ruschke said in his letter he had identified that there is a need for getting the Township Approval because it is work within the conservation area and there is a provision in the agreement that requires them to approve it. If they are working in this easement they need to have Committee approval to do that. The Township Attorney seemed to be quite adamant that he would not put it on the Township Agenda until they have a Resolution from this Board. Realistically if the Board were to vote favorably on the modified conditions shown here the memorialized resolution doesn't occur until next month and by the time that that meeting falls it could be on the March agenda. For the Township Committee to approve work in the conservation easement – when talking about the time frames of what will happen – that is the soonest that they will be able to get approval from the Township Committee. You should consider that in their plan.

Mr. Shaw – so what you are saying is that they will already be into the period of time in which this stabilization could be protected.

Mr. Ruschke said what he was saying was by the time I raised concerns, even in the past meeting, regarding doing the restoration in the spring so that when you put the grass seed and matting down – his experience is that if you don't get vegetative growth right away it is very hard to try to get the seeds planted because the matting prevents you from doing that. The best time to do it is in the spring. Frankly, just how this is unfolding regarding getting a Resolution to the Township Committee for their approval it probably will not happen until March.

Mr. Stone said they already have permission to be in the conservation area as we got it in the very beginning.

Mr. Shaw noted that what they didn't have was permission to do what occurred (damage) in the conservation easement. There is a provision in the document which requires you to cure such violations within 60 days of when it occurred. There are various penalties which can be imposed. Those are rights and responsibilities which are the Township Committees'. Those are not rights or responsibilities of this board. What this board can do is review your plans; review what is going on; but in terms of the reality of the situation until you have approval from the Township Committee for use or to conduct this restoration activity in this conservation easement you cannot precede. Mr. Shaw asked Mr. Ruschke if the restoration work/activity should go forward before there is any further site disturbance in other areas of the lot.

Mr. Ruschke said we could go into sequence of construction in that aspect. He just wanted the applicant aware that based on the Township Attorney statement on when he is going to put it on the agenda. He will not put it on the agenda until he has a memorialized resolution from this board.

Mr. Shaw - which notes the board being satisfied with whatever the proposed method of restorations.

Mr. Ruschke said if we were talking about sequences of construction then yes, if the work can start in the spring there are methods of getting the dry wells in (from bottom up), installing the piping and getting that secured, etc. So far they are practical on what they are describing. It is just a matter of timing and when they start. Some of the things/comments made by the Environmental Commission should be gone over. Restoring the slope after the pipe is in is critical doing it during the optimal time. After that area is restored and installing a super fence across or above the conservation easement – once you are done with that restoration there is no reason why they should have to go back. So they can put a super silt fence across it, they can put snow fencing across it (orange fencing to warn people to stay out) so there are no more mistakes and at that point, as recommended by the Environmental Commission, put a sign there so that people in the area are clearly made aware to stay out of the area once it is restored.

Mr. Shaw asked if the Board needed to define those conditions now. Is it something that we could make subject to the approval of the Township Engineer before they proceed?

Mr. Ruschke noted some of the things we can put into the resolution. One of the key things is from the Environmental Commission where they are asking for a detailed planting plan. He would certainly endorse that. It would not just be putting grass seed but some additional vegetation in that area to help stabilize the slopes. The Board may want to see that. Going through the sequence of construction again, the fact that they have the dry wells in; they have the drainage piping in; they have the sewer pipe up to where it is at a point with the property; a very common requirement that we impose is that once the house is framed we want to see roof leaders installed right away and get the roof water into the drywell system particularly as we don't want this water going being discharged onto the slope. A lot of times developers wait until the house is

sided, inside work is done but in this case as soon as they are done with the framing/roofing we want the water into the drywells. It would be acceptable to put temporary gutters up just to direct the water to the drywells. This would help the situation during the rest of the construction process.

Mrs. Warren said that was actually a part of their previous approval. She has reached out to the various parties already to get that process rolling. She wanted to clarify that you are saying that we would be able to put in the drywells and connect the sewers before we permanently stabilize this slope.

Mr. Ruschke said he was at the point where the conservation easement says if there is a violation you need the Township Committee to approve your restoration. You're making an argument saying that you had prior approval if we stayed within the limits of disturbance. He has reservations about starting that and getting the machinery in; disturbing the slopes and not being able to continue the whole process. Get the site temporarily stabilized until you are ready to stabilize entirely. Get the Township approval and then remobilize this site so that you can within a reasonable time (2 wks.) to get the dry wells in and stabilize the whole site.

Mrs. Kenny questioned if Mr. Ruschke was saying they can't continue construction....

Mr. Ruschke – until they have Township Committee approval. They probably cannot start until March.

Mrs. Kenny said her concern was that it was an eye sore and felt sorry for the neighbors. I wondered about a safety issue. Kids are there playing. She was a little worried about waiting until March.

Mr. Ruschke said he had reservation about starting beforehand. When you are in the planting season we can see it is done. If there is concern regarding mud than certainly they can go in and do some additional stabilization. If there is a safety issue the silt fence is there to protect the runoff. If there is some material that starts to degrade then perhaps they can reapply some hay on the slopes. That is something that needs to continuously to be looked at to maintain the site. It is not as if they don't touch the site at all as they still have to continually maintain.

Mr. Stone said they had been back this weekend because there was part of the super silt fence that needed to be restored. We are continuously monitoring and making sure that the site is safe.

Mrs. Warren – to your question, is there something preventing us from starting the foundation which does not involve the slope?

Mr. Ruschke thought in starting the foundation you would be blocking your area to properly stabilize the slope. I know you say you will do it by hand, wheel barrows. He thought it impractical.

Mr. Shaw asked if there was a stop work order on the site. Mr. Ruschke confirmed that there was.

Mr. Stone/Warren said they had never seen one. Nothing has been sent to them.

Mr. Shaw thought the Township Committee would want, as well as this Board, to know that there is a good plan in place for restoration which has been approved. What he is hearing is that there are some questions as to what that restoration plan is and we really need to get that as finalized as possible at the time of approval. It could be requiring additional plans to be submitted, reviewed and approved before we do a resolution/memorialization. He was hearing that there are some considerations out there. From prior

experiences he felt that the Township Committee will want to see that this Board has looked at the environmental issues that are associated with this and looked at plans that we feel may be acceptable.

Mrs. Warren asked if that was not part of the plans already submitted.

Mr. Ruschke said it was. The Township Committee Attorney would like to have a very clean record from this Board so that he does not have to open up the discussion on the restoration plan with the Committee members. If there is anything vague with the way it goes to the Committee the Committee may open this up and there may be the same testimony given here given to them. I think the Township Attorney is trying to make it very simple in front of the Committee.

Mr. Stone said on the plan we do say that we would meet with the arborist and review the house and the existing trees and supplement what he may feel in necessary for the site. We added that note as part of our stabilization plan. It is addressed.

Mr. Laverti said they did have a plan that Mr. Ruschke said was adequate and it is well documented.

Mrs. Kenny asked if they had seen the memo from the Environmental Commission. The second page talks about the vegetation to be chosen by them or by a professional biologist.

Mr. Laverti said that on the plan (no. 9) we do say the Township Arborist. We are meeting that request.

Mr. Shaw said that was not quite the same thing. He asked Mr. Ruschke what he had in mind as he did not want to leave it open for the Township Committee. He wanted something that the board has approved that has a set of plans.

Mr. Ruschke said he was not the one to specify what type of planning should be done to assimilate reforestation. He would refer that to one of their landscape architects or the Township arborist. It would have to be a condition of approval.

Mrs. Warren said another point that was raised in her letter referred to the fencing and signs. She also noted that the monuments are there as required.

Mrs. Kenny asked how often they would check the super silt fencing. She asked Mr. Ruschke for his suggestions.

Mr. Ruschke said he would rather inspect it before a storm. I would rather see the problem and call to have it fixed. He was advised that someone would be out there weekly to check it. If there is a weather occurrence we will check it before and after.

Mr. Shaw suggested that we include these issues as a condition. It would be preferable, if before it is memorialized, if you already had plans for the vegetation proposal that you get them to Mr. Ruschke for review. It would then be sent to the Environment Commission for their review/comments. It would be preferable to have these issues not purely as conditions in an approval but as something that has been looked at signed off and approved between now and when it is memorialized at our meeting in February 20<sup>th</sup>.

Mrs. Warren – this is the point where we put all these things down in detail.



Mr. Shaw said that what he was suggesting that the conditions concerning the method of permanently planting and stabilizing that are issues we would like to resolve before our meeting of February 20<sup>th</sup>. It would be much better to have this issue resolved.

Mr. Laverti asked if the Board would like to see a sequence of construction and then what will happen to stabilize this slope and what we will do immediately after the slope is stabilized.

Mr. Shaw also asked Mr. Murphy as to what type of plantings you will propose in there and the area for trees to be planted/replaced and what they will be. We want to have a stabilization plan that will be pretty much signed off on before the Resolution.

Mr. Murphy said he would meet with the arborist and go over the plan and forward a copy to the Environmental Commission.

Mrs. Kenny said it need not be fancy, just a schematic.

Discussed possible construction of home. (Access from top portion of project will give access from the right side of the project. Distance is 15 ft. to foundation, 14 ft. to.....)

Mr. Vivona thought that if it were to be passed by us we would be trying to eliminate any possibility of it having another stop work order.

Mr. Shaw thought that whether a stop order has/or has not been issued, until such time there would be a desire to proceed. If this board were to adopt a resolution that became effective on the 20<sup>th</sup> but has a condition where it is subject to the approval of the Township the resolution would not be effective. What he would say is that you really cannot proceed with the foundation or doing anything else to this project until you have an approval without conditions which means you need the approval of the Township Committee.

Mrs. Kenny asked if anyone knew when the next Township Committee was scheduled after the 20<sup>th</sup>. She was advised it was the fourth Thursday in February.

Mr. Shaw was asked if he thought the Township Committee could hear it on that date. He replied that it depended on how quickly they put it on their agenda. He noted the saying of "haste makes waste" and unfortunately they do sometimes prove true. The new Township attorney will need to review after we adopt it. He was not sure that a week was adequate timing.

Mr. Ruschke felt that the attorney would want to feel comfortable. He would want to understand this matter too. Will he have time to review the resolutions/plans so he can adequately answer/address any questions? He probably may not be pro-active. He may not want to touch this until he has the resolution in hand.

Mr. Shaw – it's within the boards' authority to try to get something as quickly as possible by the 20<sup>th</sup>. If it is memorialized it can certainly be sent over to the Township Attorney for review.

Mr. Laverti said they were wondering if there were any steps they could do within the powers of the town to maybe speed things up. She thanked the Board for their input.

Mr. Shaw said we still had to open this up to members of the public and in particular the Environmental Commission so we could hear what they would want to say.

Mr. Vivona asked for comments from the public.

Mrs. Stillinger, Environmental Committee – said they had sent a memo which she felt was self-explanatory. She appreciated everyone taking the time to read it. She had two comments: 1) Vegetation removed from the slope was close to identical to the vegetation that is currently on the adjoining slope. That vegetation is not native. Some of it is invasive under certain circumstances. Some of those species will do jobs for us when nothing else will. In this case the vegetation was holding the slope. She showed an illustration of what had been on slope. Removing vegetation that is well established is bad.

Mrs. Stillinger's second comment related to the bottom text in the memo where you will see that the DEP had a suggestion for protecting this conservation easement. It required conservation easements to be recorded with the Morris County Clerk. It still requires a conservation easement to be delineated by a permanent fence. She was suggesting now that a permanent fence be installed along the conservation easement. An example of how this is done on other conservation easements in town can be seen to the rear of the Kaplan property on Candace Lane. It is an attractive post/rail fence but it does separate the conservation easement area from the rest of the lot. Another would be at the Melrose Condo's. That conservation easement was required by the DEP because it is a transition area (wetlands). That fence is permanent. There is signage indicating it as a conservation easement area. She suggested that during the construction phase a bright orange snow fence be installed so that while work is being done there would be no question about where the boundaries are.

Mr. Shaw noted that this had been previously stipulated and agreed to.

Area of Easement discussed.

Mr. Vivona asked for any further comments from public/board. None Heard.

Mr. Vivona said that a lot of times when we receive an application like this it is because the damage has been done and now you just want to patch. He did not think that a regular standard silt fence would have stopped anything due to the amount of rain. We know it was not intentional, nor torn up by machinery. The numbers are astronomical going from 500 sf allowed to 4200 to 8700. It sounds way worse than what actually happened as it's not torn up property, it's a wash out. On the flip side the reason we have to be so stringent and why Mr. Ruschke has had all these rules in place is because the slope moves. The people down below have fought tooth and nail with every home that has been built there. Every builder has made promise that they would not "whatever" and every time they have washed down to the houses below, to the point where mud has flowed into the basement. We will put this up for a vote but he was telling them now that the eyes will be on you. It's a great neighborhood. You will have to be on your toes and you have to follow this to the T because you will have a stop work order faster than you can think.

Mr. Stone jokingly said they did not want to have to come back here and they understood that you did not want us here.

Mr. Vivona said he understood but he couldn't stress strongly enough how much you all had to be on their toes to make it work. In his opinion these seven lots should never have been buildable lots. It's not the Board of Adjustments call because it puts you all in a bind and the people below you in a bind. Everyone has a right to build a house he just asked again that you let everyone know that all rules/conditions had to be followed.

Mrs. Warren we will do everything to cooperate. We don't want to disturb the neighborhood.

Mr. Shaw pointed out the points discussed. If a motion is going to be made it would be contingent on installing temporary orange fencing during construction to delineate where the conservation area; they would maintain the super silt fence which would be inspected bi-weekly and before and after all storms to insure that it was in proper condition; when then conclude their construction they will be reinstalling whatever temporary measures that are in place to make sure that nothing is further damaged as construction proceed; the approval would be subject to the applicant having their planner/engineer provide a recommended planting in addition to the current proposal which would provide for the restoration and they plan would be reviewed by Mr. Ruschke and his landscaping staff as well being forwarded to the Environmental Commission for comment. Our preference would be that the condition be resolved prior to the memorialization which would make it workable for the Township Committee to review.

Mr. Vivona asked for a motion of approval subject to the conditions as noted by Mr. Shaw. Mr. Nelson made that motion which was seconded by Mrs. Kenny.

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Weston, Mr. Polise, Mrs. Kenny, Mrs. Romano, Mr. Williams - All in favor

Mr. Shaw addressed the annual report to the Township Committee. In relation to this application he advised the applicant that they would have to advertise the work session as a potential meeting. If you were able to get it done in time we could have Kali advertise our work meeting as a regular meeting so, if by any chance, you did get it all resolved before then, I can get a resolution prepare to memorialize. Why don't we do that and I will have the resolution in time for the 12 assuming that you are ready to go. That would allow the Committee a little more time for review.

**Mr. & Mrs. Hawk**

**Calendar BOA 13-102.06-27**

58 Dale Drive

Block: 102.06 Lot: 27.

Lyons McConnell, Architect

Mr. Lyon (sworn) said that currently the Hawk's have an approved building permit for their home addition. Part of that project includes constructing a rear terrace. We would like to extend a roof over that area. In that doing that it would increase the building coverage. This roof would be protection from the elements in the summer, etc. Currently there is a fairly dense green line of evergreens that was put in by the neighbor. Mr. Lyon showed the first floor plan showing the terrace which is currently under construction. What we are proposing is to extend the roof over the family room over the blue stone terrace (has a fireplace). The second drawing is A2.0 showing the proposed elevation. The area in question would be open. There will be no livable space added. The roof would be 20 ft. high. The end of the roof will have 3 gables for light and prevent wind/rain from blowing in. It will be supported with two columns. Inside there would be open rafters. The drainage would tie into the existing gutters for the house.

Mr. Vivona set up the site visit for February 8<sup>th</sup> at 9 am.

NOTE: Mr. Vivona noted that Mr. Hawk looked familiar. He asked Mr. Hawk if they had met. Mr. Hawk said they had not but because of the nature of his business they may have crossed paths. It was established that there was no conflict with Mr. Vivona sitting in on this application.

A motion was made by Mr. Nelson seconded by Mr. Williams to adjourn. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted  
Mary Ann Fasano

Transcribing Secretary